UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/759,744	01/12/2001	Ralf Hofmann	P-4592	9742

24209 7590 12/04/2006

GUNNISON MCKAY & HODGSON, LLP
1900 GARDEN ROAD
SUITE 220
MONTEREY, CA 93940

EXAMINER	
BARQADLE, YASIN M	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2153	

DATE MAILED: 12/04/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/759,744	HOFMANN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Yasin M. Barqadle	2153	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *08/03/2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-30,32-41 and 43-46* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☐ Claim(s) *1-30,32-41 and 43-46* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/06
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Response to Amendment

The amendment filed on August 03, 2006 has been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-10, 35 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanevsky U.S. Patent No. (6300947) in view of Stahl U.S. Patent No. (7072932).

In referring to claims 1, 35 and 46, Kanevsky shows substantial features of the claimed invention including:

- Receiving a request from said user device for said data (client 100, fig. 1), wherein said request includes information identifying presentation requirements of said user device "Simultaneously with the request message 102, a client sends a display mode message 103. This display mode message 103 includes several characteristics or parameters of the client display 113. One parameter is a display size that is represented as a height and width (e.g., 360 by 400 pixels). Other characteristics can include, for example: a character format and size; memory related information such as, for example, a memory address; window size, etc. (col. 3, lines 53-65 and col. 6, lines 21-28).

Although Kanevsky shows substantial features of the claimed invention including request message 102 and display mode message 103, he does not explicitly show where the

request includes both a description of a data and information identifying presentation requirements.

Nonetheless, this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Kanevsky, as evidenced by Stahl USPN. (7,072,932).

In analogous art, Stahl whose invention is a personalized network-based services, disclose, "a user creates a user profile which includes requests for one or more customized sets of information. The user profile also specifies a preferred format and preferred time for delivery of each set of information. The information requests may include, for example, news (e.g., international, financial, technology, local, sports), weather reports, traffic reports, daily calendar, reminders (e.g., birthdays, anniversaries), and music (e.g., easy listening, classical, country)." [Col. 3, lines 13-21 and col. 4, lines 44-54].

Giving the teaching of Stahl, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and the advantage of modifying Kanevsky by employing the personalized network-based services system of Stahl so that customized sets of information are delivered to one or more user devices according to specific format and specific time desired by the user.

Kanevsky as modified further teaches

- Identifying presentation requirements of said user device of said user device based on said information present in said request (see request message 102 and display mode message 103, fig. 1 col. 3, lines 53-65 and col. 6, lines 21-28); and
- Selecting a presentation scheme specific to said user device for said data from plurality of presentation schemes in accordance with said presentation requirements, wherein upon application of said presentation scheme to said data, new data presentable on said user device is generated "The display mode message can be represented as a mode number that uniquely defines display parameters. For instance, it is contemplated by the invention that tables may be created which contain display characteristics or parameters associated with a given display terminal and each table can be identified by a unique mode number. Eventually, if

the adaptor server 107 contained tables (stored in its mass storage 18) of most common display parameters associated with display screens, then the user's machine 100 need only transmit the mode number and, in response, the adaptor server 107 could locate the appropriate table and use the information accordingly" (col. 6, lines 53-64), wherein each presentation scheme in said plurality of presentation scheme is for a user device and is the totality of the configuration information needed to extract said data from a first format and transform said associated data into new data for presentation on a user device associated with said each presentation scheme, and further wherein upon application of said presentation scheme to said data, new data presentable on said user device is generated "Advantageously, the web page adaptor server 107 transforms web pages received from web site 106, via server 104, to adapt the content of the web pages to the size of the display 113 and also to satisfy the user's requirements as specified in the display mode message 103. Some examples of operations that the web page adaptor server 107 performs are the following: stripping objects from a web page if the display size of display 113 is small or adding content of links to a web page if the display size of display 113 is large" (col. 7, lines 25-33. See also col. 3, lines 53-65 and col. 6, lines 21-28).

In referring to claim 2, Kanevsky shows,

Applying said presentation scheme to said data to create said new data (see fig. 6)

In referring to claim 3, Kanevsky shows,

Said applying said presentation scheme to said data is performed by said user device: "Referring now to FIG. 4, a client web page adaptor module 112 (FIG. 1) is shown. As previously mentioned, similar adaptation functions as discussed above, as well as others, may be performed by the adaptor module 112. The adaptor module 112 is preferably run (executed) on the client machine 100 and is similar in many respects to adaptor 107 (as shown in detail and described in the context of FIGS. 3, 8 and 9). Alternatively, the client adaptor module 112 may also be incorporated into the web

browser software which the client machine employs to browse the World Wide Web." (Col. 16, lines 37-46)

In referring to claim 4, Kanevsky shows,

Transmitting said new data to said user device to allow the presentation of said new data on said user device: (col. 3, lines 53-65 and col. 6, lines 4-28)

In referring to claim 5, Kanevsky shows,

- Retrieving said data: (fig. 1; col. 3, lines 53-65 and col. 6, lines 4-28)

In referring to claim 6, Kanevsky shows,

Applying said presentation scheme to said retrieved data to create said new data: (fig. 6 col. 3, lines 53-65 and col. 6, lines 4-28)

In referring to claims 7-10, where said request includes commands selected from a group of commands consisting of load, save article, and channel (Kanevsky col. 15, lines 62 to col. 16, lines 10 and col. 17, lines 1-6).

1. Claims 11, 15, 16-20, 27-28, 30, 34, 36, 39, and 41, 43-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanevsky U.S. Patent No. (6300947) in view of Stahl U.S. Patent No. (7072932).

In referring to claims 11, 27, 36, 41 and 45, Kanevsky shows substantial features of the claimed invention including:

- Receiving a request from a user device generated by selection of a portlet identification object on the user device: (col. 3, lines 53-65 and col. 6, lines 21-28. See fig. 7 and 10, lines 36-59).
- Transferring said request to a portlet wherein said portlet retrieves data specified in said request over a network and further wherein said data has one format in a plurality of source data formats:

Kanevsky, (fig. 1, server 104 connected to websites 105, 106 and server 114 via web page adapter server 107. see also fig. 7. "Advantageously, the web page adaptor server 107 transforms web pages received from web site 106, via server 104, to adapt the content of the web pages to the size of the display 113 and also to satisfy the user's requirements as specified in the display mode message 103." Col. 7, lines10-44)

- Analyzing said request to determine a user data format that is supported by said user device (col. 8, lines 24-43)

Although Kanevsky shows substantial features of the claimed invention including request message 102 and display mode message 103, he does not explicitly show where the request includes both a description of a data and information identifying presentation requirements.

Nonetheless, this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Kanevsky, as evidenced by Stahl USPN. (7,072,932).

In analogous art, Stahl whose invention is a personalized network-based services, disclose, "a user creates a user profile which includes requests for one or more customized sets of information. The user profile also specifies a preferred format and preferred time for delivery of each set of information. The information requests may include, for example, news (e.g., international, financial, technology, local, sports), weather reports, traffic reports, daily calendar, reminders (e.g., birthdays, anniversaries), and music (e.g., easy listening, classical, country)." [Col. 3, lines 13-21 and col. 4, lines 44-54].

Giving the teaching of Stahl, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and the advantage of modifying Kanevsky by employing the personalized network-based services system of Stahl so that customized sets of information are delivered to one or more user devices according to specific format and specific time desired by the user; and

Kanevsky as modified further teaches

- Selecting a presentation scheme specific to said user device for said data from plurality of presentation schemes in accordance with said presentation requirements, wherein upon application of said presentation scheme to said data, new data presentable on said user device is generated "The display mode message can be represented as a mode number that uniquely defines display parameters. For instance, it is contemplated by the invention that tables may be created which contain display characteristics or parameters associated with a given display terminal and each table can be identified by a unique mode number. Eventually, if the adaptor server 107 contained tables (stored in its mass storage 18) of most common display parameters associated with display screens, then the user's machine 100 need only transmit the mode number and, in response, the adaptor server 107 could locate the appropriate table and use the information accordingly" (col. 6, lines 53-64), wherein each presentation scheme in said plurality of presentation scheme is for a user device and is the totality of the configuration information needed to extract said data from a first format and transform said associated data into new data for presentation on a user device associated with said each presentation scheme, and further wherein upon application of said presentation scheme to said data, new data presentable on said user device is generated "Advantageously, the web page adaptor server 107 transforms web pages received from web site 106, via server 104, to adapt the content of the web pages to the size of the display 113 and also to satisfy the user's requirements as specified in the display mode message 103. Some examples of operations that the web page adaptor server 107 performs are the following: stripping objects from a web page if the display size of display 113 is small or adding content of links to a web page if the display size of display 113 is large" (col. 7, lines 25-33. See also col. 3, lines 53-65 and col. 6, lines 21-28).
- converting said data from said source data format to said user data format using said presentation scheme: (Col. 7, lines10-44 and col. 10, lines 18-35).
- a presentation manager coupled to a web server (fig. 1, server 104 and 107)

In referring to claim 15, Kanevsky in view of Stahl shows,

- Said receiving is performed by a web server (fig. 1, server 104 and 107)

In referring to claim 16, Kanevsky in view of Stahl shows,

- Said transferring said request is performed by a portlet manager (fig. 1, server 104 and 107)

In referring to claims 17-20, where said request includes commands selected from a group of commands consisting of load, save article, and channel (Kanevsky col. 15, lines 62 to col. 16, lines 10 and col. 17, lines 1-6).

In referring to claim 28, Kanevsky in view of Stahl shows,

- Said at least one portlet comprises a mail portlet:

  "The limitations of RFC 822 mail become even more apparent as gateways are designed to allow for the exchange of mail messages between RFC 822 hosts and X.400 hosts. X.400 [X400] specifies mechanisms for the inclusion of non-textual material within electronic mail messages. The current standards for the mapping of X.400 messages to RFC 822 messages specify either that X.400 non-textual material must be converted to (not encoded in) IA5Text format, or that they must be discarded, notifying the RFC 822 user that discarding has occurred. This is clearly undesirable, as information that a user may wish to receive is lost. Even though a user agent may not have the capability of dealing with the non-textual material, the user might have some mechanism external to the UA that can extract useful information from the material. Moreover, it does not allow for the fact that the message may eventually be gatewayed back into an X.400 message handling system (i.e., the X.400 message is "tunneled" through Internet mail), where the non-textual information would definitely become useful again." *Freed, page 3, paragraphs 1 and 4*)

In referring to claim 30, Kanevsky in view of Stahl shows,

- Said at least one portlet comprises an internal network information portlet:
  An internal portlet is inherent the portal shown in Kanevsky, Fig. 1

In referring to claim 34, Kanevsky in view of Stahl shows,

- A plurality of user devices coupled to said web server (Kanevsky , Fig. 1, 113)

In referring to claim 39, Kanevsky in view of Stahl show,

- Transmitting said data converted from said source data format to said user data format to said user device to allow the presentation of said data converted from said source data format to said user data format on said user device:
  Kanevsky, (Fig. 7; col. 7, lines 25-33. See also col. 3, lines 53-65 and col. 6, lines 21-28

In referring to claim 43, Kanevsky in view of Stahl shows,

- Said user device includes a user interface having an associated user device interface format; said content is not in said associated user device format:
  Kanevsky, Fig. 7 shows the user interface of the user device and that the content isn't in the user device format

In referring to claim 44, Stahl shows,

- Each of said portlet identifiers is associated with a specific source of content: (fig. 2, shows receiving contents from specific content servers (214, 218).

Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanevsky in view of Stahl and in view of Miller ("An Introduction to the Resource Description Framework", hereinafter "Miller"). Although Kanevsky in view of Stahl shows substantial features of the claimed invention, including the presentation manager server system of claim 27 above, Kanevsky in view of Stahl does not show at least one portlet comprises an internal network information portlet. Nonetheless this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification to the system disclosed by Kanevsky in view of Stahl as evidenced by Miller.

In analogous art, Miller discloses an introduction to the Resource Description Framework (RDF). Miller shows:

"The World Wide Web affords unprecedented access to distributed information. Metadata improves access to this information and RDF is a W3C proposed standard for defining the architecture necessary for supporting web metadata. RDF is an application of XML that imposes needed structural constraints to provide unambiguous methods of expressing semantics for the consistent encoding, exchange, and machine processing of metadata. RDF additionally, provides means for publishing both a human-readable and a machine-processable vocabularies designed to encourage the exchange, use and extension of metadata semantics among disparate information communities." (Miller, conclusion)

Given these teachings, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the system of Kanevsky in view of Stahl so as to use the RDF, such as taught by Miller, in order to improve the access to information by defining a structure for metadata.

Claim 12 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanevsky in view of Stahl and further in view of Deach et al. ("Extensible Stylesheet Language (XSL) Specification W3C Working Draft 21 Apr 1999", hereinafter "Deach"). Although Kanevsky in view of Stahl show substantial features of the claimed invention, including the method of claim 11 (see 103 rejection, above), Kanevsky in view of Stahl do not show said selecting a presentation scheme comprises selecting an XSL-stylesheet. Nonetheless this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification to the system disclosed by Kanevsky in view of Stahl as evidenced by Deach.

In analogous art, Deach discloses the Extensible Stylesheet Language (XSL) specification. Deach shows:

"XSL builds on the prior work on Cascading Style Sheets [CSS2] and the Document Style Semantics and Specification Language [DSSSL]. XSL provides the most of the formatting objects and properties of CSS. (Conceptually, the formatting objects of CSS are indicated by using the "display" property of CSS on some existing source element.) Over 90 percent of the properties in XSL are properties that are already

defined in CSS. This set of properties (and formatting objects), however, is not sufficient to accomplish all the goals of XSL. In particular, this version of XSL introduces a model for pagination and layout that can be extended, in a straightforward way, to page structures beyond the simple page models described in this specification.

XSL was developed to allow a designer to control the features needed when documents are paginated as well as to provide an equivalent "frame" based structure for browsing on the Web. To achieve this control, XSL has extended the CSS set of formatting objects and formatting properties. In addition, the selection of XML source components (elements, attributes, text nodes, comments and processing instructions) that can be styled is an extension of the CSS selector set." (Deach, sect. 1.2, par. 1 and 3)

Given these teachings, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the system of Kanevsky in view of Stahl so as to use an XSL-stylesheet to implement the presentation scheme, such as taught by Deach, in order to allow the user to fully control the formatting of the data.

Claims 13, 14, 21, 23-26, 37, 38, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanevsky in view of Stahl and in view of Freed et al. (RFC 2046, hereinafter "Freed").

Claims 13, 14, 21, 23-26, 37, 38, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanevsky in view of Stahl and in view of Freed et al. (RFC 2046, hereinafter "Freed").

In referring to claims 13, 14, 21, 37, 38, and 40, Kanevsky shows substantial features of the claimed invention, including:

- Receiving a request from a user device generated by selection of a portlet identification object on the user device (see claim 11, 103 rejection above)

- Transferring said request to a portlet wherein said portlet retrieves data specified in said request over a network and further wherein said data has one format in a plurality of source data formats (see claim 11, 103 rejection above)
- Analyzing said request to determine a user data format that is supported by said user device (see claim 11, 103 rejection above)
- Selecting a presentation scheme to convert said data from said source data format to said user data format (see claim 11, 103 rejection above)
- Converting said data from said source data format to said user data format using said presentation scheme (see claim 11, 103 rejection above)
- Transmitting said data converted from said source data format to said user data format to said user device to allow the presentation of said data converted from said source data format to said user data format on said user device (see claim 39, 103 rejection above)

Although Kanevsky in view of Stahl show substantial features of the claimed invention However, Kanevsky in view of Stahl do not explicitly show the data formats are MIME types. Nonetheless this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious application of the system disclosed by Kanevsky in view of Stahl as evidenced by Freed.

In analogous art, Freed discloses Multipurpose Internet Mail Extensions (MIME). Freed shows:

"Since its publication in 1982, RFC 822 has defined the standard format of textual mail messages on the Internet. Its success has been such that the RFC 822 format has been adopted, wholly or partially, well beyond the confines of the Internet and the Internet SMTP transport defined by RFC 821. As the format has seen wider use, a number of limitations have proven increasingly restrictive for the user community.

...

The limitations of RFC 822 mail become even more apparent as gateways are designed to allow for the exchange of mail messages between RFC 822 hosts and X.400 hosts. X.400 [X400] specifies mechanisms for the inclusion of non-textual material within electronic mail messages. The current standards for the mapping of

X.400 messages to RFC 822 messages specify either that X.400 non-textual material must be converted to (not encoded in) IA5Text format, or that they must be discarded, notifying the RFC 822 user that discarding has occurred. This is clearly undesirable, as information that a user may wish to receive is lost. Even though a user agent may not have the capability of dealing with the non-textual material, the user might have some mechanism external to the UA that can extract useful information from the material. Moreover, it does not allow for the fact that the message may eventually be gatewayed back into an X.400 message handling system (i.e., the X.400 message is "tunneled" through Internet mail), where the non-textual information would definitely become useful again."

(Freed, page 3, paragraphs 1 and 4)

Given these teachings, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of adjusting the system of Kanevsky in view of Stahl to use MIME data types as the data formats, such as taught by Freed, in order to maintain *"compatibility with existing standards AND [for] robustness across existing practice"* (Freed, pg. 4, par. 8).

In referring to claims 23-26, where said request includes commands selected from a group of commands consisting of load, save article, and channel (Kanevsky col. 15, lines 62 to col. 16, lines 10 and col. 17, lines 1-6).

Claims 32 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanevsky in view of Stahl and in view of Jones et al. ("Web-based Messaging Management Using Java Servlets", hereinafter "Jones"). Although Kanevsky in view of Stahl show substantial features of the claimed invention, including the presentation manager server system of claim 27 above, Kanevsky in view of Stahl do not show the use of servlets. Nonetheless this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious (addition/modification) to the system disclosed by Kanevsky in view of Stahl as evidenced by Jones.

In analogous art, Jones discloses web-based messaging management using Java

servlets. Jones shows:" *Cost: Free-use Java-based software libraries provide management-specific support, including the Internet Simple Network Management Protocol (SNMP), topological map display, performance management, and fault management; Security: Public-key security mechanisms can be incorporated directly into management applications, providing access control, confidentiality, and application-to-application authentication. In the case where web protocols are trusted, it becomes possible to issue management operations across security perimeters called "firewalls";*

Flexibility: Software development environments and APIs are readily adaptable to suit custom requirements; Evolution: There is a general industry migration trend towards secure, web-based management. Web browsers are ubiquitous and have become a common user interface to both the Internet and to management information; the tools for developing web-based applications have likewise become abundant and inexpensive. Management applications can evolve in concert with web-based management solutions developed by individual messaging component vendors. Performance: The transfer of information over an unreliable network using web protocols is superior in performance and reliability to the transfer of that information using the SNMP protocol. Thus, connectivity between management domains can be improved."(Jones, conclusion, par. 3-7)

Given these teachings, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of adjusting the system of Kanevsky in view of Stahl so as to use servlets, such as taught by Jones, in order to take benefit from the cost, security, flexibility, evolution, and performance advantages of servlets.

Conclusion

The prior made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yasin Barqadle whose telephone number is 571-272-3947. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Burgess can be reached on 571-272-3949. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9306 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained form the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either private PAIR or public PAIR system. Status information for unpublished applications is available through private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

YB

Art Unit 2153